

5th Australasian Housing Researchers' Conference



17-19 November 2010, University of Auckland, New Zealand

‘Closing the Gap’ on Indigenous housing disadvantage in urban areas: A framework for analysis of current social housing delivery models

Rhonda Phillips

Queensland AHURI Research Centre, Institute of Social Science Research,
University of Queensland, r.phillips2@uq.edu.au

Vivienne Milligan

City Futures Research Centre, Faculty of Built Environment
University of New South Wales, v.milligan@unsw.edu.au

Abstract

Recent years have seen significant policy focus on ‘closing the gap’ on Indigenous disadvantage and reforms in service delivery to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander households and communities. While priority attention has been paid to addressing the unacceptable housing conditions in remote and discrete communities, there is a strong case for greater policy attention to addressing housing disadvantage in urban and regional areas where three quarters of all Indigenous Australians live.

This paper reports some preliminary outcomes from an AHURI funded study of social housing service delivery for Indigenous households in urban and regional areas. It examines the current Australian policy directions and service delivery practices to identify leading practice in meeting housing needs in ways that are consistent with cultural values and Indigenous aspirations. It examines the roles and relationships between ‘mainstream’ and Indigenous specific services and the cultural appropriateness of service responses in meeting the heterogeneity of housing needs experienced by Indigenous people.

The paper will discuss findings that draw on academic and policy literature from housing and other human services domains, a comparative review of Canadian urban Indigenous housing service delivery and preliminary findings from empirical case study research in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland.

Keywords: Indigenous housing; culturally appropriate services; social housing;

This paper draws on the early stages of an AHURI research project by the authors and colleagues (Dr Hazel Easthope and Professor Susan Green (UNSW) and Professor Paul Memmott (UQ)).¹ The subject of the project is social housing service delivery for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians living in urban and regional locations. It aims to improve understanding of how housing services are best delivered to meet housing needs within Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and thereby to contribute to overcoming Indigenous disadvantage. Underpinning the study is the belief that services should be provided in ways that are consistent with cultural values and Indigenous aspirations. Key themes concern the respective roles of, and relationships between, mainstream and culturally specific housing services, including the nature of service integration. Importantly, the study addresses a research gap by focusing on the delivery of housing in urban and regional settings where almost 80 per cent of Indigenous people reside (COAG 2008).

Social housing, accommodates nearly 30 per cent of Indigenous households and should be a key policy domain for ‘Closing the Gap’ on Indigenous disadvantage (AIHW 2009). By ‘social housing’ we mean housing that is acquired with government funding for long term letting to eligible households at rents that are geared to a tenant's capacity to pay. Indigenous social housing may be designated for Indigenous occupancy or it may be general social housing that is occupied by households including one or more Indigenous people. This housing may be owned and/or managed by government or not for profit community agencies.

Recently, policy attention has been directed primarily to the unacceptable housing situation in remote Indigenous communities and this has tended to obscure recognition of the extent of housing disadvantage of those who reside in urban towns and cities. We contend that it is important to right this imbalance by developing a comprehensive response to urban housing needs and by allocating dedicated resources in response to the multiple dimensions of Indigenous housing need (see AIHW 2009). In framing such responses we question over-reliance on simplistic distinction between urban (and regional) and remote housing needs.

Urban and remote housing issues for the first Australians have common underpinnings including the legacy of historical alienation and racism, profound economic disadvantage, social exclusion and cultural damage. Cultural factors such as kinship responsibilities demand sharing and mobility also impact on housing situations regardless of location (Altman 2008; Neutze 2000). Differences relating to proximity to housing markets and supply conditions in remote areas are significant but do not diminish the housing disadvantage experienced by low-income urban dwelling households. These factors, along with affiliation to traditional cultures values will, however, influence the nature of the housing problems and how they are experienced (Neutze 2000). Housing needs are inter-connected across different geographies, partly due to high levels of mobility and migration that occur across urban and remote locations and partly due to the way that governments have constructed their policy and service responses to Indigenous needs over a long period (Milligan et al 2010; Habibis et al 2010; Memmott et al 2006).

Fundamental to our approach to this study is recognition of the special status of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders as ‘first peoples’, including the presence of traditional owner residents in urban settings. This special status entails a right to self-determination, understood as a

‘relational concept that embodies a recognition that Indigenous peoples operate in an interdependent, inter-cultural sphere and seek ... respect for cultural values and legitimisation of their right to participate meaningfully in decision making processes affecting them’ (Milligan et al 2010, p13; SCRGSP 2009, p.11-12).

¹ Milligan, V., Phillips, R., Easthope, H. and Memmott, P. (2010)

The special status of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples also recognises the detrimental impacts of colonisation, displacement and discrimination on spiritual, health, economic and social well being.

The findings and views of the authors presented in this paper are based on research undertaken as phase 1 of the study. For this phase, methods included reviews of: the Australian social housing policy and service context; Australian and international literature concerning the delivery of services for urban Indigenous peoples in social housing and other human services domains; and recent policy and service delivery directions for urban Indigenous housing in Canada. Initial findings from preliminary analysis of phase 2 data from fieldwork case studies undertaken in urban locations in Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland also inform the paper.

Urban housing needs

The cumulative social disadvantage experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander households and communities is starkly reflected in differences in housing tenure compared to the non-Indigenous population (Table 1). Across Australia, Indigenous households are over 5 times more likely to live in public housing than non-Indigenous households and they are half as likely to own or be buying a home. One in nine public housing tenancies includes Indigenous residents and concentration in this tenure is growing.

Table i : Households by tenure type and Indigenous status, 2006

<i>Tenure type</i>	<i>% of Indigenous households</i>	<i>% of non-Indigenous households</i>
Home owner/purchaser	34.2	68.9
Private and other renter ^(a)	31.3	23.0
State or territory housing authority	20.0	3.9
Indigenous and mainstream community housing	8.9	0.5
Other tenure/not stated ^(b)	5.6	3.7
Total	100.0	100.0
Total number	166,659	6,977,437

(a) Includes dwellings being rented from a real estate agent and from persons not in same household and the category 'landlord not stated'.

(b) Includes: 'other tenure type' and 'tenure type not stated'.

Source: ABS 2006 reproduced in AIHW (2009:25)

Indigenous housing need in Australia is officially measured using a multidimensional model with five attributes quantified currently - homelessness, affordability, overcrowding, dwelling condition, and connection to essential services (power, water and sewerage) (AIHW 2009). By applying a summative 'dwelling gap' measure of data on these needs, the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare has calculated that in 2006 at least 10,550 dwellings were required to meet all Indigenous housing need in non-remote areas, mainly as a result of overcrowding and unaffordable housing. Over 50 per cent of total assessed need across all areas was in non-remote areas (AIHW 2009: Tables 8.6 and 8.7).

As additional funds for meeting the dwelling gap in urban and regional areas have not been earmarked, there is community concern that needs in those areas will continue to 'blow out' (Narushima 2009). This situation has led to criticism by Indigenous leaders that the indicators used to determine the allocation of resources have been selective, giving rise to false distinctions in need.

'The government has identified remote Australia as the area of greatest need, which is a lack of recognition of need in urban areas. It's how they're defining need. In remote areas it's availability and in the city it's affordability. It's the same need.'
(Gooda, quoted in Narushima 2009).

The policy context

Evidence of need notwithstanding, urban Indigenous housing issues have long been overshadowed by policy concern about the extreme housing situation in remote areas. Recent attention by all levels of government acting together through the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) has resulted in a series of new agreements to 'close the gap' in Indigenous disadvantage by improving service delivery and outcomes for all Indigenous Australians (for example, COAG 2008, COAG 2009a, COAG 2009b). However, additional resources for much needed new housing and upgrading have been targeted to remote communities under the Remote Indigenous Housing National Partnership Agreement, which provides for \$5.5 billion capital funding over ten years from 2008/09 to build 4200 new homes and repair 4800 existing dwellings in 26 designated remote areas (from Milligan et al 2010, Table 1). This has been accompanied by requirements to transfer responsibility for housing management in those communities to state housing authorities (COAG 2009b).

By contrast, in urban areas the Commonwealth has withdrawn from active policy and funding responsibility for providing additional housing, instead passing this responsibility to State and Territory governments. On one hand this can be seen as a rational response to the fragmented policy and program arrangements resulting from previous overlapping Commonwealth and State/Territory responsibilities. However in practice, sole reliance on State/Territory efforts runs the risk of a lack of specific policy attention and/or too few additional resource allocations to urban Indigenous housing issues, particularly as transparency and accountability mechanisms are not well developed.

The primary policy directions evident in urban areas include improving access to mainstream housing services and examining the potential role of market-based solutions like home ownership and private renting (Housing Ministers 2009). Within the social housing sector, the emphasis is on allocating housing to those most in need, especially those at risk of homelessness. This has produced an increased rate of allocations of Indigenous households to public housing (see Table 2).

Table ii : Changes in number and percentage of Indigenous households in public housing, 2003-2008

	<i>Indigenous households in public housing</i> 2003	<i>Indigenous household as % of all public housing</i> 2003	<i>Indigenous households in public housing</i> 2008	<i>Indigenous households as % of all public housing</i> 2008	<i>% change Indigenous households In public housing</i> 2003-2008
NSW	8,700	7.1	9,800	8.2	12.6
Victoria	1,006	1.6	1,379	2.2	37.1
Queensland	2,491	5.1	3,742	7.4	50.2
WA	2,363	7.8	4,751	15.7	101.1
SA	1,118	2.5	1,421	3.4	27.1
Tasmania	447	3.8	750	6.5	67.8
NT	1,451	26.5	1,850	36.8	27.5
ACT	185	1.7	260	2.4	40.5
Total	17,761	5.3	23,953	7.2	34.9

Source: Calculated from SCRGSP (2008). Limitations of data specified in original table.

Between 2003 and 2008 the number of Indigenous households in public housing increased nationally by 35 per cent (reaching as high as a 50 per cent increase in Queensland and over 100 per cent in Western Australia), while the percentage of overall public housing tenancies increased by 2 per cent over the same period. These state averages do not reflect the extremely high concentrations of Indigenous tenancies now occurring in places with higher Indigenous populations. There is every reason to expect that these trends will intensify under current policy settings and management arrangements.

State housing authorities promote improvements in public housing access by Indigenous households as a major achievement in the context of the priority to reduce urgent housing need and homelessness. However, this achievement comes with problems of capacity to deliver culturally appropriate responses, including lack of suitable housing stock, difficulties in sustaining many tenancies and deepening the reliance of Indigenous peoples on government-run housing. The public housing system is highly constrained in being able to provide housing of the size, location and design best suited to Indigenous households. The resulting high concentrations of Indigenous tenants in inappropriate housing on public housing estates commonly results in overcrowding, neighbourhood conflict and tenancy breaches. Abandonment by Indigenous tenants in unsafe or unharmonious neighborhoods or in response to fear of punitive landlord action (against arrears or anti-social behaviour for example) is relatively high also. Increasing the share of public housing occupied by Indigenous households per se does not address the complex personal and culturally specific needs of Indigenous households. Ultimately when this set of issues is not adequately addressed, the results can include instability, intra-family and inter-community mobility, and displacement and homelessness within urban Indigenous communities.

At the same time that housing opportunities in public housing are expanding, Indigenous specific housing is in decline. Identified Indigenous public housing programs (often termed 'state owned and managed Indigenous housing' or SOMIH) are largely being delivered as a mainstream policy and service response with little or no differentiation from mainstream public housing. Only Victoria has advanced an alternative Indigenous-run service. At the same time there has been a loss of dedicated national funding for community controlled Indigenous housing organisations (IHOs) accompanied by expectations that IHOs will transition to operate under mainstream community housing funding, policy and regulatory regimes. The outcome of these policy directions (as well as the take over by public housing of housing management in some remote communities discussed above) has seen a significant decline in the number of IHOs in most jurisdictions across Australia. Even more critical is a decline in housing earmarked for Indigenous households that potentially can be provided under a culturally specific policy and service framework (Milligan et al 2010).

Comparisons with similar policy directions promulgated in Canada since 1993 give disturbing warnings about the longer term consequences of current Australian policies. As in Australia, the Canadian government has retained responsibility for housing in remote and discrete communities with expectations that provinces will accept responsibility for urban housing issues. This left many urban-based Aboriginal housing providers in extended limbo with limited access to dedicated funding or institutional support. Unlike Australia, however, the urban Aboriginal housing organisations in Canada have been able to maintain national and provincial representative bodies that have been active participants in housing policy processes and continue to advocate for recognition and growth of Aboriginal specific housing services through both dedicated and mainstream programs. Some small-scale municipal, provincial and national initiatives to fund specialist housing projects have emerged in response to these efforts, resulting in modest growth for a small number of urban organisations. The overall result has been for less resilient housing providers to collapse and stronger ones to tread water, sell off property assets to fund operating losses, or attempt to integrate with mainstream community housing and compete for what have been static to declining mainstream funding opportunities. Moreover, the characteristics of unmet housing need among urban Aboriginal peoples in Canada (dominated by homelessness, overcrowding and

low levels of home ownership) have not been altered by devolution and mainstreaming (Milligan et al 2010).

The parallels are evident with the situation in Australia of overreliance on mainstream government housing provision and limited investment in the sustainability or growth of Indigenous controlled housing.

Key themes

The remainder of the paper will focus on two dominant and interlocking themes emerging from the study. The first concerns the value of strong and effective Indigenous institutions and the importance of structures that support Indigenous self-determination and participation in decision-making. The second concerns the nature and characteristics of culturally appropriate service delivery.

Indigenous institutions and engagement

This section highlights some of our key findings regarding the roles and importance of institutions that mediate the space between Indigenous and non-Indigenous worlds (Milligan et al 2010). In particular, we have sought to understand better the potential of specialist and community controlled Indigenous housing organisations as well as opportunities to engage Indigenous communities in decision-making processes.

First, our findings highlight the existence of more clearly articulated policy and stronger legal frameworks to protect the rights and promote the positioning of Indigenous peoples in countries such as Canada, New Zealand and the USA compared to Australia. In large part this seems to relate to community and political acceptance of the special position of Aboriginal peoples as 'First Nations' and the reflection of that status in treaties or in statute. This is not merely an ideological issue but has very real implications for the way policy is framed and opportunities for meaningful participation and a voice in policy and service development processes (Walker and Barcham 2010).

Second, there is a strong case for retaining explicit and specialist urban Indigenous housing and homelessness policies, strategies, programs and targets. This is important because of both the extent of entrenched disadvantage and the characteristics of housing need that are experienced by many Indigenous Australians, as outlined above. It is also crucial because policies and services need to be tailored to meet the specific and diverse cultural and lifestyle needs and values of local Indigenous communities, if self-determination is going to be advanced.

Third, the available evidence highlights a need for, and the value of, retaining *both* identified Indigenous services and culturally appropriate mainstream services. Dual service systems improve the capacity to respond to the diversity within Indigenous populations, to provide choice, to catalyse local innovation and to meet the needs of particularly marginalised clients. Some Indigenous people prefer to utilise generic services that may provide broader opportunities and a degree of anonymity. For others, the sense of identity and community associated with Indigenous specific services is important and provides opportunities for participation and contributing to wider community development and enterprise. In addition, many Indigenous people have experienced discrimination, stigmatisation or are unable to access and navigate mainstream service systems. Identified or community controlled services are better positioned to provide culturally safe and accessible options.

Fourth, there can be mutual benefits for clients and service providers where Indigenous specific and mainstream services are able to work collaboratively. These include easier pathways and transitions for clients who move between (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) services, increased choice for clients as well as sharing of expertise and cultural knowledge between service providers. However, the difficulties of integrating Indigenous and mainstream services should not be underestimated. Inter-cultural collaboration requires trust, has costs and participants in such endeavours may face significant challenges. These need to be

overcome through dedicated resources to support collaboration, investing time, building trust and having clear objectives and shared purpose. This requires cultural respect, cross-cultural sensitivity, knowledge and training and creation of a safe and respectful working environment (Milligan et al 2010; Lumby & Farelly 2009).

Fifth, Indigenous housing organisations have an important role in overcoming disadvantage and community strengthening in urban areas. Apart from the client benefits discussed above, these organisations are usually well connected to community, can attract Indigenous staff and provide a valuable space for nurturing community participation and leadership development. Sixth, and following from the last point, explicit and ongoing support and funding needs to be directed at building the institutional capacity of Indigenous housing organisations, individually and collectively.

Seventh, Indigenous individuals and organisations should have a strong voice and participation in housing policy development and service design. Following the dismantling of ATSIC and several federal and state-based policy, planning or advisory structures, there are few formalised or ongoing forums that promote Indigenous participation in housing issues and Indigenous housing networks are conspicuously weaker than in other social policy areas, such as health and education.

Finally, research and evaluation effort needs to be continuously directed at understanding the best approaches to delivering successful housing services to urban Indigenous residents.

Culturally appropriate housing services

Significant effort has been applied across human services systems in Australia and internationally to developing conceptual frameworks, policy and practice aimed at providing culturally appropriate services for Indigenous people. This is in recognition that services are not accessible or successful for many Indigenous people who either face discrimination or are alienated by mainstream approaches.

A useful framework for recognising the cultural dimensions of service delivery is provided by Thomas (2002) who distinguishes a typology of approaches that includes:

- Programs and services that are culture specific for non-dominant ethnic groups (such as Indigenous specific housing services);
- Bicultural and multicultural mainstream services; and
- Mainstream mono-cultural services.

This framework points to important distinctions that avoid the usual culturally specific versus mainstream dichotomy. It opens up the opportunity to consider what culturally appropriate mainstream services might look like and also raises questions about the relationship between these mainstream services and culturally specific services. This approach is particularly useful in light of the changing modes of housing provision (discussed above) that are dramatically increasing the role of mainstream and public provision and diminishing the role of Indigenous specific services.

Using this framework, we suggest that Indigenous housing policy, funding and service delivery structures until about the mid 1990s were characterised by separate development of Commonwealth funded, culture specific Indigenous housing providers, and state managed mono-cultural public housing authorities. This separate development of the Indigenous social housing services arose partly from a segregationist view of self-determination that was prevalent at the time. Critiques of this view point to negative consequences such as abdication of responsibility by mainstream services for addressing Indigenous housing need widespread failure to adequately support the development of viable Indigenous housing services (Slockee 2009).

In response to such critiques, policy attention turned in the late 1990s to a more integrated approach that simultaneously sought to build capacity and improve Indigenous specific housing services and to move towards a bi-cultural approach by mainstream services. This was embodied in a new national direction for Indigenous housing launched by Housing Ministers in 2001, known as Building a Better Future: (BBF) Indigenous Housing to 2010 (Housing Ministers' Conference 2001). While BBF had a 10-year time frame, additional resources that had been expected were not delivered and the policy drive abated. Since the abolition of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) in 2005, the focus of policy attention has shifted again to mainstream delivery at the expense of indigenous specific services. Our preliminary findings suggest that the current situation in social housing can be described as dominantly mono-cultural mainstreaming, despite rhetoric to the contrary. While various constrained and (mostly) small scale initiatives that have been designed to promote self determination and culturally adapted services have survived alongside of this dominant mode of provision, many of these are in decline or face an uncertain future, partly as a result of recent government decisions to take over their service role in return for continuing financial assistance.

So what is culturally adapted practice? How can we distinguish bicultural or multicultural services from those that we characterise as mono-cultural mainstreaming? Based on review of Australian and international literature on culturally appropriate human services delivery, we propose six criteria for assessing culturally appropriate service systems (Milligan et al 2010; Walker and Barcham 2010; Lumby & Farelly 2009; United Nations 2008; DHS 2008; COAG 2008; NHMRC 2005; Thomas 2002; CMHC 1999). These are:

- Service provider organisations promote cultural respect and awareness
- Staff demonstrate cultural competence
- Physical environments and service delivery respects cultural diversity
- Service delivery is informed by Indigenous clients, staff and communities
- Strong networks exist between Indigenous specific and mainstream service providers
- All providers are accountable for practice and outcomes

To provide a framework for the empirical phase of the study, we have used these key attributes of cultural proficiency to develop a series of questions about the social housing service system as shown in Table 3.

The next stage of the research will apply this framework in three urban locations that have large Indigenous populations and an array of housing service agencies. Examining a small number of localities in detail aims to provide a better appreciation of what happens on the ground in housing services. Examples from three distinctive jurisdictions will help to reveal how varying historical pathways, current policy settings and different reform priorities are shaping this system and its capacity to respond.

Conclusions

Based on interim findings from our study, this paper has argued the need for specific policy, funding and service delivery attention to addressing the disproportionately high housing needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians living in non-remote locations. These housing needs are diverse as are the histories, cultural values, lifestyles, aspirations and capabilities of urban dwelling Indigenous people. In responding to housing needs, it is essential to take account of this diversity and the special status of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians as 'first peoples'.

Table 3. Urban Indigenous Housing Service Delivery: an analytic framework

Service Delivery Domain	Research Questions
Housing provider organisations promote cultural respect and awareness	<p>Do the organisation's vision, purpose, values and priorities demonstrate cultural awareness?</p> <p>Do codes of conduct promote cultural respect?</p> <p>Do organisational leaders drive sustained change?</p> <p>Are resources allocated to support cultural proficiency?</p> <p>Do planning, housing supply responses and housing management policies recognise and respond to the diversity of local Indigenous cultural values, lifestyles and housing needs?</p>
Staff demonstrate cultural competence	<p>Do staff have access to training and professional development that promote cross-cultural competency?</p> <p>Do staff performance systems emphasise cultural competency?</p> <p>Do staff exhibit appropriate language/communication styles?</p>
The physical environment and service delivery responses respect cultural diversity	<p>Is the physical environment welcoming and does it present positive representations of local Indigenous culture?</p> <p>Do Indigenous clients perceive services as safe and accessible?</p> <p>Is service delivery practice (tools, etc.) culturally appropriate and evidence based?</p> <p>Do service responses build on community strengths (know the community, know what works)?</p> <p>Is the design, location and amenity of housing appropriate?</p>
Service delivery is informed by Indigenous clients, staff and communities	<p>Does the organisation seek active engagement with consumers and communities that sustain reciprocal relationships?</p> <p>Are Indigenous staff employed and mentored and are their accountabilities to both the organisation & their community recognised?</p> <p>Does the organisation demonstrate a commitment to self-determination and respectful partnerships?</p> <p>Do consumers and communities effectively participate in designing, monitoring and implementing programs?</p>
Strong service networks exist, especially between Indigenous and mainstream services	<p>Do strong local networks operate that involve Indigenous and non-Indigenous housing services?</p> <p>What is the nature of trust, power relations, collaboration, coordination and partnerships between mainstream and specialist providers?</p> <p>Is the status and expertise of Indigenous organisations recognised by mainstream services? Is their advice and training sought by mainstream organisations?</p> <p>Is there evidence of shared responsibility for creating and sustaining relationships and working together?</p>
Housing providers are accountable for practice and outcomes	<p>Are services continually monitored, reviewed and adapted?</p> <p>Does evaluation emphasise feedback from Indigenous tenants, staff, services and communities?</p> <p>Are there efforts to improve data collection and analysis?</p>

Source: Milligan et al 2010

Two specific themes have been discussed in this paper. The first concerns arguments for promoting strong Indigenous institutions and opportunities for engagement. We argue in particular for increased attention to strengthening and growing Indigenous housing organisations. This is based on the evidence pointing to the critical role of culturally specific services in providing: services to those most disadvantaged in mainstream services; choice for service users; an Indigenous voice in policy and service development; and a site for building community capacity and leadership.

The second theme we examine is culturally appropriate services. We review the evidence on what constitutes cultural appropriateness and identify criteria for assessing mainstream services. We argue the need for greater attention to issues of cultural appropriateness in the current situation where mainstream housing agencies increasingly dominate and there is increased reliance of Indigenous people on these services.

Finally, we reiterate the main ideas identified in our interim findings (Milligan et al 2010) about how the social housing policies and service system might best operate in order to improve housing outcomes and at the same time strengthen Indigenous communities and their capacity to become more self reliant, and thereby contribute more effectively to addressing Indigenous housing disadvantage. We conclude that to deliver appropriate and effective services, the social housing system needs:

- Systemic change – designing the system to achieve an appropriate mix of viable mainstream and specialist services, strengthening IHOs, developing the cultural capacity of public and community housing agencies;
- Policy adaptation – understanding where policy differences are necessary and justified and empowering client service staff to respond accordingly;
- Cultural practice – overcoming the legacy of past approaches; achieving a high standard of cultural competency;
- Engagement – having the structures and resources to support respectful and meaningful community participation in decisions about housing design, housing policy and service issues;
- Robust relationships – building sustainable partnerships between service providers and across service sub systems (that is the public, community and Indigenous housing sectors); and
- Accountability – adopting cultural competency standards, evaluating outcomes and culturally appropriate regulation of all providers.

Reference list

- AIHW 2009, *Indigenous Housing Needs 2009: A Multi-Measure Needs Model*, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, Canberra.
- Altman, J 2008, 'A Genealogy of 'Demand Sharing': From Pure Anthropology to Public Policy', in *Ownership and Appropriation: A joint international conference of the ASA, the ASANZ and the AAS*, University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- CMHC 1999, *Evaluation of the Urban Social Housing Programs*, Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Ottawa, Canada.
- COAG 2008, *National Indigenous Reform Agreement (Closing the Gap), Schedule F, Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Finance Relations*. Available from: <http://www.coag.gov.au/intergov_agreements/federal_financial_relations/docs/IGA_FFRR_ScheduleF_National_Indigenous_Reform_Agreement.pdf>. [11 Feb. 2010].
- COAG 2009a, *Closing the Gap: The National Urban and Regional Service Delivery Strategy for Indigenous Australians*. Available from: <http://www.coag.gov.au/intergov_agreements/federal_financial_relations/index.cfm>. [5 Feb. 2010].
- COAG 2009b, *National Partnership Agreement on Remote Service Delivery*. Available from: <http://www.coag.gov.au/intergov_agreements/federal_financial_relations/index.cfm>. [11 Feb. 2010].
- DHS 2008, *Aboriginal Cultural Competence Framework*. Melbourne, Victorian Department of Human Services.
- Habibis, D, Birdsall-Jones, C, Dunbar, T, Gabriel, M, Scrimgeour, M & Taylor, E, *Improving Housing Responses to Indigenous Patterns of Mobility*, Positioning Paper no. 124, AHURI, Melbourne.
- Housing Ministers' Conference 2001, *Building a Better Future: Indigenous Housing to 2010*.
- Housing Ministers' Conference 2009, *Implementing the National Housing Reforms: Progress Report to the Council of Australian Governments from Commonwealth, State and Territory Housing Ministers*, Victorian Government Department of Human Services, Melbourne.
- Lumby, B & Farelly, T 2009, *Family Violence, Help-Seeking & the Close-Knit Aboriginal Community: Lessons for Mainstream Service Provision*, Australia Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse.
- Memcott, P, Long, S & Thomson, L 2006, *Indigenous Mobility in Rural and Remote Australia. Final Report No. 90*. Melbourne, AHURI.

- Milligan, V, Phillips, R, Easthope, H & Memmott, P 2010, *Service Directions and Issues in Social Housing for Indigenous Households in Urban and Regional Areas*, Paper no. 130, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne.
- Narushima, Y 2009 'Housing Spending Ignores Needs of Urban Aborigines', *Sydney Morning Herald*.
- Neutze, M 2000, 'Housing for Indigenous Australians', *Housing Studies*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 485-504.
- NHMRC 2005, *Cultural Competency in Health: A Guide for Policy, Partnerships and Participation*, National Health and Medical Research Council, Canberra.
- SCRGSP 2008, *Report on Government Services 2008: Indigenous Compendium*, Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision, Canberra.
- SCRGSP 2009, *Report on Government Services 2009: Indigenous Compendium*, Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision, Canberra.
- Slockee, T 2009, 'Oh, When Will They Ever Learn? A Personal Perspective on Aboriginal Housing Issues', *Reform* vol. 94, pp. 27-30.
- Thomas, DR 2002, 'Evaluating the Cultural Appropriateness of Service Delivery in Multi-Ethnic Communities', *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 50-56.
- United Nations 2008, *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2008*, United Nations, New York.
- Walker, R & Barcham, M 2010, 'Indigenous-Inclusive Citizenship: The City and Social Housing in Canada, New Zealand, and Australia', *Environment and Planning A*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 314-331.

